

**AFFIDAVIT IN THE FORM OF A GROUP RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION AND OBJECTION**

USCA Case Number 20-13594 J re21

5:19-mc-00010

SATCOMM, ET AL

V.

[P]ayPal ('PayPal'), ET AL

---

**[Petition in the form of an Affidavit requesting a Vacating or ORDER]**

---

**I. Address change not honored:**

A. Attached is a copy of the address change sent the court and not honored:

1. The copy is attached by reference, as we note the record, it is clear that the appeal was brought by "Eeon", and the main premise of the appeal was that it appears that the court is attempting to ignore the existence of "Eeon".
2. What we have is a failure on the part of the court and its officers to follow the rules, for instance, notice of address change (304 South Jones Boulevard, VOID EEON 1967 OPT-OUT, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89107) was sent to the court notifying you of the incarceration status of "Eeon", whereby he was falsely accused and the appeals court for the state of California agreed by overturning the case and all charges have been dismissed.
3. Eeon notified this court as well as the lower District Court, that he had a contract with PayPal, a prior relationship, and that they had attempted to change the terms of the agreement between the parties, which constituted a new offer. That in acting on behalf of himself and on behalf of SATCOMM,

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

accepted their offer under condition, which the law of contracts acknowledges the right of a party to so engage.

**II. Failure to notify:**

4. It has been on occasion that the court has stated that Eeon and/or SATCOMM has failed to respond to the court, where it is presumed that the clerk has mailed out documents that were never mailed, as they were never received. However, if we operate on the mailbox rule, especially with reference to an incarcerated individual this court, and its judicial officers, must acknowledge receipt of the notice of change of address of the District Court. And that the District Court recognizing that Eeon was a party to the matter but ruling that the case had been dismissed denied him the right to a fair trial.
5. He was a party to the appeal, he was named in the appeal he was named in the contract he was named in the District Court, and this court has not sent a single notice to EEON, in violation of due process and the rules of the court and I object.

**III. CLASS FILING- LICENSED To Practice Law Is Illegal and We Object...**

An Affidavit- "Affidavits" *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 536 n.28 (7th Cir. 1981) ("Affidavits are often the only supporting **evidence** for the issuance of a search or arrest warrant, which, as noted above, requires a higher standard of proof. **Affidavits alone should therefore certainly be sufficient to prove a *prima facie* case** in summons enforcement proceedings.")

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

**I. INTRODUCTION**

A. The court permitted 'PJ...PAL' to file several documents on the record under the guise that somehow it is lawful for the court to "licensed to practice of law", admitting them to the bar the court under such obscenity.

II. We brought this to the attention of the court on numerous occasions:

B. THE STATE, whether on its own initiative or through any of its quasi-corporations, does not have the authority, jurisdiction, and or the power 'to license to practice of law' and any such attempt to do so, is illegal.

C. Note what the Supreme Court of the United States of America had to say and to landmark cases, Sims vs. Ahrens and Schware vs. the Board of examiners:

- i. "The practice of law cannot be licensed by any state. Schware v. Board of Examiners, United States Reports 353 U.S. pgs. 238, 239. In Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925) The practice of law is an occupation of common right, as we have stated this is because everyone is required to know the law, and since everyone is required to know the law everyone has the right to practice law, even assuming such an occupation associated thereto. Which is precisely the reason why the Supreme Court has held in both of the aforementioned precedent-setting cases, that no state can licensed to practice of law they do not have jurisdiction to do so.
- ii. This Court has documented that it authorizes, condones, and grants licenses to others to practice law before its bar. This court does not

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

have the jurisdiction and authority to violate the law through its arbitrary decisions and allowing others to practice Law, which according to the Supreme Court, such is a violation of law and in this instance appears to be done willfully, intentionally, deliberately, in an ongoing conspiracy to deny the people of this country and the affiant's of their right's as secured under the Bill of Rights, to a fair and impartial trial. In the same stance it would appear that "THE COURT" wants to sit and judge those who were simply accused with an accusation of violation of law.

D. We have placed legal precedent on the record, which fully supports our position('s) only to have this body ignore us as if We do not exist. But yet when one of the illegally licensed to practice law attorneys does the exact same i.e. petitions the court, the court gives them all the due notice and attention according them respect and honor, here.

E. Again we object to such unconstitutional, unlawful, denial of due process of the bill of rights, rights and we do so perpetually.

III. The right practice law, is there any question?

F. The United States Congress per the will of the of the people is empowered to make law, yet to be present day, it is the courts that say that they have a 200-year history of suggesting that only a license attorney represent a corporation. 200-years, why that is a long time, however, it is a misguided and misrepresented unlawful statement. For note this, the aforementioned cases highlight that within the past 100 years the Supreme Court has firmly held that "**NO State may license**

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

**to practice of law**"! Which means that there is no 200- year history requiring that a corporation be represented by a licensed attorney, when the Supreme Court has held that '**no state may subject the right to the practice of law**'! The highlighting of the so-called history denotes the illegality of such a history, as it is a known fact that corporations have constitutional rights, Supreme Court has held in hobby lobby as well as the citizens United cases and as such the following is held true: 'The corporation is a creature of the state, owing its existence and charted power to the state', this is derived from Redfield v. Fisher (1930). Even if the court relied on such, it is Congress who would have to create a law requiring corporations only be represented before the court by an attorney, why?

G. Simply put, the court does not have the authority to restrict access to the court on any level! For the court is always to be open, and the Constitution for the United States of America requires access to the court or government to be unrestricted, and since corporations have been deemed by the courts to be people and or persons under law we note the following: "but even a corporation has the right to access the Court and that right to access the Court must be equal to the rights of the people to access the Court".

H. We must cry foul and raise our continual constitutional objection, and since the Atty. Gen. is a party we have presented our objection and thus maintain a matter of record by the court, as required by the principles of due process and the law. Simply the court license as a process, we under the equal protection of law clause of the Bill of Rights, say that if the court has the authority to issue a license to practice law, then by the same right which the court receives such authority we

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

exercise the very same authority. This is not an argument this is not to be construed as a challenge to anything but the courts authority and jurisdiction to assume as well as presume that it could trample on the common rights of the people.

- I. We recognize and understand the clerk of the court is simply an officer, the same as the United States Marshals, and only performs a ministerial service for the court. And as long as the court requires an attorney to submit to notification through the electronic email system, parties have the right to utilize such system and serving process for another party, and that if the clerk of the court is required to provide such service as part of its ministerial duties, does not prohibited nor bar the affiant's, from utilizing that same ministerial clerk who is performing a ministerial duty in doing the same.
- J. 'PJ...PAL', and "the COURT", are state actors, each have acted so as to misrepresent the facts to fit their unlawful the right to practice law, a common right is held by the Supreme Court of the United States of America. Eeon has brought such a challenge before this court, and since the Supreme Court has made the decision and determination that corporations are persons under law, exercising constitutional rights at their leisure, corporations have the right to counsel of choice-that is a legitimate complaint. This is a cognizable constitutional challenge that cannot simply be done away with by failing to serve notice on a party.
- K. This court nor 'PJ...PAL', has not served the single notice upon Eeon as required by law and the Bill of Rights due process of law clause and I object.

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

L. This court accepted the filing of the appeal which documented Eeon, to be a party to the matter, to be a party to the appeal, and had a duty to notify him of any and all prerequisites and failed to do so, and I object.

M. By accepting the filing of the appeal, the court accepted and acknowledged the interest of Eeon.

N. Right after acknowledging his existence, the court proceeds not to notify him, when it was obvious that it was he who was challenging the issue of whether or not he was a party of interest, a member or party to the contract between the parties, and a party to the arbitration award in these arbitration matters. This court has done an injustice and has not acted honorably in favoring **THE NATIONAL PUBLIC POLICY** of administering justice fairly. Access to the court may not be denied and/or blocked due to technicality, and since Eeon was a proper party named in the complaint this court had no jurisdiction to take his monies which he paid for the filing fee and to dismiss the case without opportunity to be heard, to respond, and/or to be aware of such notice.

IV. Documentation of Prior relationship and agreement

1. The attached is a notice of change in terms of agreement, of which the SUMMARY proceeding court, stated 'did not exist'. Please note that the attached notice of change in terms of agreement between the parties predates not only the

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

8

arbitration hearing, the decision by the District Court, but is directly related to this matter and it also predates the decision by this court not to communicate with the Affiant, and I object. Notice whom the following is to address, the email, the name, and the specificity as to whom the communication is directed, i.e. a party of interest.

**Upcoming changes to our PayPal  
legal agreements**

From [PayPal](#)  
To [eeon@satcomm911.com](mailto:eeon@satcomm911.com)  
[noreply-HP2v40000016b2a574za7af6b1e6e96638900144@mail.paypal.com](mailto:noreply-HP2v40000016b2a574za7af6b1e6e96638900144@mail.paypal.com)  
Reply-To  
Date 2019-06-05 18:11

**Message Body**



Hi Ee On,

We're making some changes to our legal agreements that will apply to you.

There is no action needed from you today, but if you would like to learn more, you can find details about these changes, **when they apply and what you can do if you want to decline the changes** on our **Policy Updates page**. You can also view these changes by visiting [PayPal.com](https://www.PayPal.com), clicking 'Legal' at the bottom of the page and then selecting 'Policy'.

PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

9

Updates'.

If you have questions about any of these changes or your account, please don't hesitate to get in touch with us.

Thank you for being a PayPal customer.

Sincerely,  
PayPal

Please do not reply to this email. We are unable to respond to inquiries sent to this address. For immediate answers to your questions, visit our Help Center by clicking "Help" located on any PayPal page or email.

PayPal, Inc. is Licensed as a Money Transmitter by the New York State Department of Financial Services. PayPal, Inc., NMLS #910457, License #FT3345, Massachusetts Foreign Transmittal License. PayPal, Inc., Transmit Money By Check, Draft or Money Order By The Department of Banking, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. PayPal, Inc. Rhode Island Licensed Money Transferor. PAYPAL, INC., NMLS #910457, LICENSE #34967, IS LICENSED BY THE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF BANKING AND FINANCE. PayPal, Inc. is Licensed by the State of Connecticut Department of Banking to perform Money Transmission, NMLS #910457, License Number MT-910457.

Copyright © 2019 PayPal, Inc. All rights reserved. PayPal is located at 2211 N. First St., San Jose, CA 95131.

NA08256

- O. There will be objection, after objection, after objection, however, this is an affidavit and so the objection must be in the form of a rebuttal supported by facts and conclusions of actual law.
- P. I had a right to file an appeal, the courts are always "to be opened", and yet this court and the judicial system has been closed to my person. You have my address,

## PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

10

you knew where I was, you never notified me, a party to this appeal. I had to go online, type in the name SATCOMM, (and this while doing a social media video, imagine my surprise, and the surprise of my audience, when I discovered for the first time in the month of March 2021, that the court had dismissed my appeal, and had failed to notify me, imagine that?), to find a case on a website that is not related to the court,

([https://www.pacermonitor.com/public/case/31454966/SATCOMM\\_v\\_PAYPAL\\_et\\_al](https://www.pacermonitor.com/public/case/31454966/SATCOMM_v_PAYPAL_et_al)), that showed the matter was dismissed by this review court for what is believed to be failure to prosecute (Tuesday, October 20, 2020

appeal USCA Mandate Tue 10/20 11:13 AM

MANDATE of USCA DISMISSING appeal as to21 Notice of Appeal, filed by SATCOMM(vs)

Att: 1 Cover Letter

Monday, September 28, 2020

appeal USCA Case Number Mon 09/28 2:59 PM

USCA Case Number 20-13594 J re21 Notice of Appeal, filed by SATCOMM. (vs)

Tuesday, September 22, 2020

appeal Transmission of Notice of Appeal and Docket Sheet to USCA Tue 09/22 10:42 AM

Transmission of Notice of Appeal and Docket Sheet to US Court of Appeals re:18 Judgment,17 Order on Motion to Dismiss,,, Order on Motion for Hearing,,, Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief,,, Order on Motion to Intervene,,, Order on Motion to Strike,,21 Notice of Appeal, JudgeAppealed: Marc Thomas

Treadwell. Fee: Paid. (vs)

Appeal Instructions Tue 09/22 10:41 AM

Appeal Instructions re21 Notice of Appeal. The Transcript Information Form and instructions are available on the District Court website under Forms & Guides. **\*\*PLEASE NOTE\*\* Separate forms must be filed for each court reporter.** Transcript Order Form due by 10/9/2020 (vs)

utility REMARK Tue 09/22 10:45 AM

REMARK : Appeal transmitted for second time. Per a phone call with the Court of appeals and Defendant's Attorney the first transmission (07/07/2020) was not received. (vs)

PERPETUAL OBJECTION - CASE FILING CAPTION'S

11

Thursday, September 03, 2020

appeal Electronic Availability of ROA Thu 09/03 1:24 PM

Pursuant to F.R.A.P 11(c) the Clerk of the District Court for the Middle District of Georgia certifies that the record is complete for purposes of this appeal re:21 Notice of Appeal,. The entire record on appeal is

available electronically (vs)

Tuesday, July 07, 2020

appeal Transmission of Notice of Appeal and Docket Sheet to USCA Tue 07/07 2:26 PM

Transmission of Notice of Appeal and Docket Sheet to US Court of Appeals re:18 Judgment,17 Order on Motion to Dismiss,, Order on Motion for Hearing, Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief, Order on Motion to Intervene, Order on Motion to Strike,,21 Notice of Appeal, JudgeAppealed: Marc Thomas

Treadwell. Court Reporter: Darlene Fuller. Fee: Paid. Receipt Number: GAM500036313 (vs)

appeal Notice of Appeal Tue 07/07 2:22 PM

NOTICE OF APPEAL as to18 Judgment,17 Order on Motion to Dismiss, Order on Motion for Hearing, Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief, Order on Motion to Intervene, Order on Motion to Strike, by SATCOMM. Filing fee \$ 505.(vs)).

Impossible, the paying of \$500 to file the case could in no way mean that somebody was failing to prosecute. The appeal was timely taken, the appeal brief was filed in advance, why because the courts continue to do exactly what this court did to my person. So the appeal brief is filed on the record in advance so that nobody can say that this person does not intend to prosecute!

a. “Appeal transmitted for second time. Per a phone call with the Court of appeals and Defendant's Attorney the first transmission (07/07/2020) was not received”, constituted ex parte communication, it is believed that it was this conversation that caused this appeal be dismissed, and I must object. Whether or not, you believe that this happened, I am raising the likelihood of such sense we departed so far from normal procedure that it allows one to call into question the procedure employed in the first instance.

Q. You see “Ignorance OF THE LAW IS NO EXCUSE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!”, yet ignorance of policies, rules, procedures are wholly excusable. No one is required to know

the rules, except those who are governed by them, under their jurisdiction. No one is required to know policies, except those who establish them, and those who fall under their authority. No one is required to know the rules, except the rule makers, and those to whom the rules may or may not be assigned to by or through a jurisdictional nexus by way of subscription and/or application to subscribe.

R. Because I do not know your rules but I know that a notice of appeal is mandatory and an appeal brief is mandatory, and while incarcerated I have no access to the mails because the males were being blocked and after notifying the District Court of such and such continues to be an ongoing conflict with your detention center/institutional systems, one files notice of appeal immediately with notice of appeal brief routinely, which is not prohibited and or forbidden.

S. Please stop locking my access to the court, please process my appeal, order response to my appeal brief, and or the clerk of the court for the district court, a member of this body to forward whatever documents they have on file to you. The process of requiring somebody to provide documents to you that you have access and all you have to do is write a letter and have it sent through institutional process is dumbfounding, and I hereby challenge such mundane procedures as the interfere with the due process rights to access the court of the common people. I have knowledge that the court is usually asking for transcripts or recordings, or dockets, and or other forms that are held by the custodian of records, the clerk of the court and/or its deputies. These are officers of the court, having the court

asked someone to get something from its officers that it already has in its records, is again a redundancy in the system that is been irritating people for years.

Although I don't know the rules of the court at the time that this appeal was filed I had no access to any information regarding what was required of this court, and only am assuming that that's the reason since I never received the notice from the court and the information on that website mentioned before, was vague, just a statement. So, I say to this body, I have the right to appeal this matter and I do so in line with justice and the fair administration of the judicial process in America, as the right to have notice that a matter is pending, and to be able to choose for oneself whether or not they will appear, acquiesce, forfeit, and/or contest has not been eroded, so far as I know.


T. Relying on technicalities has never been in line with justice, is not the rule of law in America and I must hereby demand to see a copy of the proof of service from the clerk of the court upon my person, a party to the appeal.....  
I'm still waiting..... and still nothing, amazing

We also note that to the present day no party has rebutted a single affidavit point by point on the record as required in law *United States v. Kis*, 658 F.2d 526, 537 (7th Cir. 1981) ("The assertions by affidavit of a valid civil purpose are adequate to show a *prima facie* case that would support the issuance of a show cause order."), and that the rebuttal period having passed on each one, PalPal is time-barred, and realizing their error, they are attempting to conspire with the judicial officer('s) to involve the

court in a conspiracy against the rights of citizens of the United States of America, which is illegal, and we object.

**AN ALL-INCLUSIVE VERIFICATION**

The aforementioned information is wholly accurate, attested as such, witnessed by and before the true God Jehovah under penalty of divine retribution if otherwise. This is placed before this body on this 7<sup>th</sup> day of April 2021 as such will help us God."";";..."



A handwritten signature consisting of several loops and lines. The name "s/ Eeon" is written near the top right of the main loop. Below it, the name "/s/ SATCOMM" is written near the bottom right of another loop. The signature is written in black ink on a white background.

**ALL-PURPOSE PROOF OF SERVICE**

Page | 1

I, Brett Eeon Jones, being at or above the age of 18, of the age of the majority and a citizen of the United States of America, did mail the aforementioned document to:

United States District Court  
Middle District of Georgia  
475 Mulberry Street Fl 1  
Macon, GA 31201-9201

U.S.P.S. Tracking No.: 9405511699000226911435

Affixing the proper postage and depositing it with the local postal carrier, also being of the age of the majority, and not a party to this action who upon receipt guarantees delivery as addressed and/or local drop box guaranteeing the same as prescribed in law. If called upon I provide this sworn testimony based on firsthand knowledge of the aforementioned events attesting and ascribing to these facts on this day April 12, 2021.

*/s/ Brett Eeon Jones*